

PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of September 27, 2004, Meeting

Members Present: Linda Snider, Joseph Dixon, Tom Dantzler, Rick Lucas

Staff Present: Steve Butler, Planning Director; Jack Dodge, Principal Planner;
Mike Scarey, Senior Planner; Holly Anderson, Senior Planner;
Brian Galloway, Associate Planner

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Approve Minutes of August 30, 2004, Meeting:

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to approve the minutes of the August 30, 2004, meeting as presented.

3. Public Hearing:

A. Staff Presentation on Proposed Zoning Code Amendments Related to Clarifying the Parking Garage Standards within the City Center and Creating a New Definition for a "Mural" and a "Mural Sign"

New Section 15.10.175.3 Development Site - "A development site is the sum total of all parcels of property incorporated into the development." Development sites would be determined based on property ownership. Four parcels with one owner would be considered one development site with one parking structure allowed. Four parcels, each in separate ownership, would be considered four development sites with four parking structures allowed.

Section 15.10.449 Parking Structure, Stand-alone - "A parking structure used exclusively for the parking of motor vehicles, either public or private, for a fee for any period of time."

Jack Dodge advised that the new language relative to development sites and stand alone parking structures would be applicable only within the City Center, but that similar language could be used to amend standards that would apply to outside the City Center.

Steve Butler explained that the amended language, with the exception of the definitions, would appear only in Section 15.35 City Center Standards so it would be clear that the regulations apply only within the City Center area.

The City Council determined that stand alone parking structures would be limited to 300 stalls, with additional stalls allowed for commercial park and fly if open space, public access trails, or water features were included. All additional parking would be dedicated to associated development on the site.

Discussion was held about the 300 stall limitation and potential economic impacts to developers; and that commercial park and fly was intended as an ancillary use to enhance revenue.

Section 15.16.020 Definitions

30.1 Mural – A design or representation without letters, numbers, or trademarked graphics, that is painted or drawn on the exterior of a structure façade that does not advertise a business, product, service, or activity of the business contained within the building or structure. A mural may have the signature of the person painting the sign, or copyright ownership of the mural painting. A mural shall not incorporate any portion of a sign, as defined in this Chapter, in its design or representation.

30.2 Mural Sign – A design or representation with letters, numbers, or trademarked graphics, that is painted or drawn on the exterior of a structure façade that advertises the business, product, service, or activity contained within the building or structure. Mural signs shall conform with all requirements of this Chapter. A Mural Sign will include the name of the business or activity being conducted within the building or structure. Off-premises mural signs are not permitted.

In answer to a question, Jack Dodge explained that a business could have a mural on one façade of a building and a mural sign on a different façade of the same building.

Discussion was held, and it was decided that all references to structure façade would be changed to building façade.

Steve Butler recommended that the public hearing be opened, testimony taken, and the public hearing continued to the Planning Commission's next meeting to give the Commissioners an opportunity to review revised language.

B. Public Hearing on the Proposed Zoning Code Amendments

The Chair opened the public hearing at 6:07 p.m.

Hearing no requests to speak, the Chair continued the public hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting. The date will be announced before the end of this meeting.

C. Discussion about Possible Recommendation to the City Council Regarding the Proposed Zoning Code Amendments

After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that the Commission would hold October meetings on October 11 and October 25.

The Chair announced that the September 27 public hearing regarding Proposed Zoning Code Amendments Related to Clarifying the Parking Garage Standards Within the City Center and Creating a New Definition for a “Mural” and a “Mural Sign” would be continued to October 11.

4. Old Business:

A. Continued Review of 2004 Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments’ “Final Docket” (with a focus on Transportation, Community Image, and Environmental Management)

Mike Scarey reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments as follows:

Transportation

It was suggested that Map 3.3 should be numbered 3.4.

Mike Scarey stated staff would review the issue to ensure that map numbers correspond with text references; however, map numbers don’t necessarily relate to policy numbers within the Comprehensive Plan, but are numbered sequentially according to a separate section of the Table of Contents. He also clarified that in Text Amendment #27, that the 24th/28th arterial extension was being changed to the 28th/24th arterial extension.

Map 3.5 Truck Routes – This map is a preliminary draft and will be revised as information is gathered. The proposed truck routes in the vicinity of 24th Avenue South and South 144th and South 146th Streets will primarily serve to direct Port of Seattle and Boeing Spares truck traffic to Des Moines Memorial Drive and State Route 518.

Text Amendment #28 – Commissioner Dantzler provided a three dimensional model of the subject area and recommended that Policy 3.2J be stricken from the Comprehensive Plan. He believes this policy has served its purpose and achieved its goal. Adjacent property owners (assessed at \$5.00 per square foot), and the Port of Seattle (assessed at \$.50 per square foot), together with matching State dollars funded the construction of 28th/24th Avenue, which is now complete. His concern is that the Port has been unable to fund a permanent south access to the airport, and will use 28th/24th Avenue indefinitely as an interim south access. As a result, the private property owners along 28th/24th Avenue will be unable to develop their land

to its highest and best use because of airport traffic. Mr. Dantzler suggested that proposed language would allow private property owners 700,000 square feet of development capacity rather than the original 1,000,000 square feet because the Federal Detention Center has already used approximately 300,000 square feet of the development potential under the proposed language.

Mike Scarey advised that staff would meet with Public Works to determine if language changes are appropriate.

The South Aviation Support Area (SASA) was defined in a Port Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), assuming the SASA area would be accessed from the airport side and used for repair and maintenance of airplanes.

Community Image

Mike Scarey explained that most of the illustrations and graphics in this element are being replaced with updated photographs.

Discussion was held about SeaTac gateway signs sponsored by a private business; the Hughes Property remaining a historical and cultural resource and clarifying or removing references to “adult uses in the discussion section of Policy 6.11.

Environmental Management

Staff will provide a clarification regarding whether or not Bow Lake is a Class I or Class II wetland.

B. Continued Discussion about Proposed Amendments to the Wireless Communications Facility (WCF) Regulations

Holly Anderson stated that the Commissioners have now been provided with a draft Master Plan, revised draft regulations, definitions, and a summary table. The results of tonight’s discussions will be incorporated and sent to the Commissioners at the end of this week. The current schedule includes a public hearing on October 25, and a recommendation to the City Council on November 1. Cityscape will make a presentation to the City Council on October 26, with action by the Council scheduled for November 9. (The consultants would be available to meet with the Commissioners on October 25 to answer questions.)

Discussion was held, and it was decided that either staff or a Commissioner would report the results of the October 25 public hearing to the City Council, and that all comments received by staff from wireless facility providers on the draft regulations would be provided to the Commissioners prior to the public hearing.

Equipment Enclosure/Compound

An equipment enclosure (previously called equipment shelter) is defined as cabinets, shelters, pedestals, or actual structures used exclusively to contain radio or other equipment.

An equipment compound is the fenced area that encloses everything including the cabinets.

Accessory Structure

An accessory structure would be constructed to match the primary residence or other buildings on the site to house equipment.

Holly Anderson stated that under current code, landscaping standards would apply to both equipment compounds and accessory structures. A problematic issue is that various WCF sites do not have water service; therefore, if the City requires landscaping, the provider must install a costly irrigation system.

Discussion was held about aesthetic impacts of not requiring landscaping; allowing antennas and equipment on residential property; facilities in the right-of-way with equipment enclosures off-site; requiring all equipment to be located underground, but that in certain cases it may not be feasible; and the City allowing equipment to be located underground, but not requiring it.

The following suggestions were made by Commissioner Dixon:

- Underground compounds should be prohibited because of the expense, multiple compartments pose complications, it would be difficult to return the site to original condition if abandoned, flooding problems, and difficulty in concealing access.
- WCFs should be prohibited in right-of-ways because right-of-ways should be protected for future street widening and sidewalks, adequate WCF sites can be provided on city-owned buildings and parks, they would be difficult to landscape, sites on a non-arterial street would have to be moved if the street became an arterial, and because they would be an eyesore.
- The definition of building is excellent; however, the definition of structure may need clarification.

Summary Table of Development Standards

Equipment enclosures are limited to 360 square feet. Discussion was held, and it was decided that language would be revised to ensure it was clear that each provider was allowed an enclosure of 360 square feet.

No limits are being proposed on the size of an equipment compound.

Hierarchy

Extensive discussion was held regarding Option 1 and Option 2, particularly the reasons why siting facilities on city-owned properties was the priority. The Planning Commission asked that an Option 3 be developed “allowing the private sector to compete equally with the City” to site facilities.

Discussion was then held regarding the issue of WCF (wireless communication facility) versus WTF (Wireless Telecommunication Facility); high voltage signs on equipment compounds; and revising language relative to a flagpole without a flag.

5. New Business:

A. Initial Review of Potential Zoning Code Amendments Regarding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's)

Mike Scarey stated that the intent of the amendments is to make accessory dwelling unit regulations less restrictive, thereby complying with a State requirement that the City employ reasonable measures to accommodate future growth targets.

Discussion was held about screening requirements for guest parking at a bed and breakfast, limits on the number of rooms and guests, and State's sixty-day timeline requirements regarding review of proposed City amendments.

6. Commission Liaison's Report:

The September 11 Transportation & Public Works Committee meeting agenda included the following items: (1) Storm Drain Cleaning Contract; (2) Adoption of New Penalties for Violations of Stop Work/Unsafe to Occupy Orders; (3) Code Enforcement Corrections to the SeaTac Municipal Code; (4) Cost Estimate for Bike Lanes and Signage on 24th Avenue South and South 136th Street; (5) Cost Estimate for Intersection Work on South 144th Street and 24th Avenue South; (6) Military Road Consultant Contract; (7) Approval for the Military Road South Local Agency Agreement; (8) Sound Transit Update.

The September 9 Land Use & Parks Committee meeting agenda included the following:

(1) Presentation on the Proposed Conceptual Design for the Port of Seattle's Rental Car Facility; (2) Presentation on Sound Transit's South 154th Street Light Rail Transit Station Design; (3) Overview of the "South Tukwila" Development Being Proposed by La Pienta; (4) Discussion about Potential Zoning Code Amendments regarding Accessory Dwelling Units; (5) Continued Discussion about Coordinating SeaTac's Domestic Animals Regulations and King County Animal Control Division's Requirements; (6) Update about Proposed Wireless Communication Facilities Regulations; (7) Continued Discussion about Forming a Neighborhood Revitalization Committee (this item was listed on the agenda, but was not discussed).

7. Planning Director's Report:

Steve Butler stated that at the September 28 City Council meeting, a presentation would be made by Craig Ward and the consultants regarding the New Economic Strategy Triangle (NEST) Study of vacant or unutilized properties in SeaTac, Burien, and Des Moines.

A presentation will be made at the October 12 City Council meeting regarding the Tunnel Art Project, with the artist and Port of Seattle staff in attendance.

8. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15.